UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/559,978	12/08/2005	Kan'ichi Sato	04244/LH	7660	
	7590	EXAMINER			
220 Fifth Avenu		CHENEVERT, PAUL A			
16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3612		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/18/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/559,978		SATO, KAN'ICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	Paul A. Chenevert	3612						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejectio E FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee leave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the complex of Appeal has been filed. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	 ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 							
appeal; and/or								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane, anonamone (i	. 02 02 1).					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 30 and 37-39. Claim(s) objected to: 35 and 36. Claim(s) rejected: 18,20-23,26,27 and 34. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		ll be entered and an ex	planation of					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/GLENN DAYOAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3612	/Paul A. Chenevert/ Examiner, Art Unit 3612							

Continuation of 13. Other: The Applicant argues on page 13 "that even if the combination suggested by the Examiner were considered to be reasonable, Iwasa et al and Novell do not teach or suggest a second sound absorbing member comprising a sound absorbing material filling at least one space defined by the ribs at the second side of the foundation body panel as in claims 18 and 34 of the present invention." This argument is not persuasive. Norvell (1995) teaches "filling" two spaces on opposite sides of a foundation body. Iwasa et al. (1998) teach "filling" one space under a foundation body panel and then creating improved sound absorbing pockets "filled" with air. Iwasa et al. could have simply followed the prior practice of "filling" two sides of a foundation body panel with sound absorbing materials (as presently claimed by the Applicant), but they improved upon the prior practices and discovered a weight-reducing practice of providing air pockets. "Filling" the air pocket spaces of Iwasa et al. would not destroy the reference, it would just provide a "different" acoustical dampening property rather than simply providing air to "fill" the spaces. For this reason, the Applicants arguments are not persuasive.